

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 5,646,290 (Lorenz et al.) in view of U.S. 4,689,078 (Koike et al.). The applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Specifically, the Examiner is stated at page 5, last paragraph of the office action,

“it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have used the aqueous suspension of Lorenz et al. in an inkjet process for printing on textile materials since the Koike et al. reference discloses that inkjet printing inks have a particle size of 30 $\mu$ m or less to prevent clogging of the nozzle in the inkjet printer and the aqueous suspension of Lorenz et al. has a particle size of between 0.1 and 5 $\mu$ m”.

The applicant respectfully disagrees. Enclosed is a declaration from Dr. Muth an ink jet expert from DyStar Textilfarben GmbH & Co. Deutschland KG explaining why the Examiner's view is not correct and why a person of ordinary skill in the art would not do what the Examiner is stating (see page 2 of the declaration). Dr. Muth points out that the particle size of an aqueous dyestuff suspension is not a sufficient indicator for its usefulness as an ink for an inkjet process for printing on textile materials. For the above reasons, this rejection should be withdrawn.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

A one month extension fee has been paid. Applicant believes no additional fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 03-2775, under Order No. 14069-00236-US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: September 17, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Ashley I. Pezzner/  
Ashley I. Pezzner

Registration No.: 35,646  
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP  
1007 North Orange Street  
P. O. Box 2207  
Wilmington, Delaware 19899-2207  
(302) 658-9141  
(302) 658-5614 (Fax)  
Attorney for Applicant